

into office with a perfect knowledge of the power of the Legislature; and if the exigencies of the Government require a reduction of their salaries, we conceive there will be no cause of complaint. You will also perceive, the law requiring the Governor to reside at the seat of Government, is contemplated to be repealed, which we deem equivalent to the reduction in his pay. We might extend the argument much further, by citing other changes, both of the Constitution and of the acts of Assembly, which directly or indirectly effected the incumbents of office—but we deem it unnecessary.

Your honorable body further object to the said bill on account of its horizontal character. Our object in proposing the bill in that shape was, we thought it right to reduce all salaries of the officers of the State, and believed such a bill would operate equally and fairly. By this bill, the Treasurer, with whom you seem to sympathize, would receive \$1,500, besides the perquisites of his office, which we believe is \$500.

You further suggest, that the reduction of the pay of the members might tend to the disadvantage of the public, by excluding a highly meritorious class of citizens from the halls of legislation. With all due respect, we are constrained to say, that we cannot concur with your honorable body in this sentiment. Taking into view the reduced prices of living at the seat of Government, the reduction would be fully justified by that consideration alone. Aside from that, when we compare the compensation provided by the bill, with the remuneration for like services in many of our sister States, we apprehend none of the evil consequences suggested by your message.

You conclude by saying, "you would cheerfully agree to a regular system of retrenchment," and yet we are at a loss to know what kind of retrenchment would suit your views, when you object to the reduction of the salaries of Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer and members of the Legislature. Had your honorable body returned the bill which passed this House on the 7th of the last month, at an earlier period, we would have had an opportunity of giving your views more deliberation, and would have been happy in having your full concurrence; but we do not believe under any circumstances, we could devise a better or more equitable bill to reduce the expenses of the State. And the necessities of our common constituency, who are borne down by taxation, require this remedy at our hands; and under a perfect knowledge that they require and expect a rigid system of retrenchment, we do hope this Legislature will not adjourn without answering their expectations and gratifying their demands.

In conclusion, we beg leave to say, that in consideration of the reduced prices of all articles of living, we believe the salaries as fixed by this bill would yield a far better support to the present incumbents, than the salaries as now fixed gave to their predecessors, whilst those who are called upon to supply the demands of the